



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,604	11/14/2001	Avi J. Ashkenazi	P2730P1C25	1800
35489	7590	08/30/2006	EXAMINER	
HELLER EHRMAN LLP 275 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD MENLO PARK, CA 94025-3506			LANDSMAN, ROBERT S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1647	

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/993,604

Applicant(s)

ASHKENAZI ET AL.

Examiner

Robert Landsman

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2006.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 119-131 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 119-131 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/29/06.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but prior to a decision on the appeal. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/29/06 has been entered.

### ***1. Formal Matters***

- A. The Amendment filed 6/29/06 has been entered into the record.
- B. Claims 119-126 and 129-131 are pending and are the subject of this Office Action.
- C. All Statutes under 35 USC not found in this Office Action can be found, cited in full, in a previous Office Action.

### ***2. Specification***

- A. The specification remains objected to for the reasons already of record on page2 of the Office Action mailed 8/11/05.

### ***3. Priority***

- A. For the reasons given below under 35 USC 101, the priority date remains that of the instant invention, 11/14/01.

### ***4. Information Disclosure Statement***

- A. References 3, 5, 26, 35, 39, 42, 51, 54, 60, 69, 87, 117 and 119 on the IDS filed 6/29/06 have been lined through since they only cite abstracts and are duplicates of references cited on the same IDS.

### ***5. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

- A. Claims 119-126 and 129-131 remain rejected under 35 USC 101 for the reasons already of record on pages 2-4 of the Office Action mailed 1/29/06.

Art Unit: 1647

Applicants have demonstrated that the mRNA of the present invention is overexpressed. Applicants have argued on pages 6-13 of the Response that numerous reference demonstrate that cDNA/mRNA levels correlate to protein expression levels. These arguments have been considered, but are not deemed persuasive. First, while a number of these references demonstrate that rt-PCR may show a correlation between cDNA/mRNA and protein levels, Applicants have not used rt-PCR techniques in their Example. Applicants have measured nucleotide levels using alternate forms of measurement. No paper that Applicants have cited on pages 6-13 of their arguments shows the use of the method of the present invention is a predictor of protein levels with respect to cDNA/mRNA, nor have Applicants pointed out any reference in the 151 references that uses the method of the instant example to successfully predict protein levels.

While the Examiner acknowledges the teachings of Alberts and Lewin, which disclose that initiation of transcription is the most common point for a cell to regulate the gene expression, it is not the only means of regulating gene expression. For example, Alberts also teaches that there are a number of other controls that can act later in the pathway from RNA to protein to modulate the amount of protein that is made, including translational control mechanisms and mRNA degradation control mechanisms (see Alberts 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., bottom of pg 453). Meric et al. states the following:

The fundamental principle of molecular therapeutics in cancer is to exploit the differences in gene expression between cancer cells and normal cells. [M]ost efforts have concentrated on identifying differences in gene expression at the level of mRNA, which can be attributable to either DNA amplification or to differences in transcription.

However, Meric et al. also goes on to state that gene expression is quite complicated, and is also regulated at the level of mRNA stability, mRNA translation, and protein stability (see page 971, Introduction). Meric et al. also teaches that there are a number of translation alterations encountered in cancer, including variations in the mRNA sequence as a result of mutations, alternate splicing and transcription start sites, alternate polyadenylation sites, and alterations in the components of the translation machinery (see pages 973-974).

Applicants do supply the Polakis II Declaration. The "first" Polakis Declaration was previously discussed in the Office Action mailed 8/11/05. Similarly, the second Polakis declaration under 37 CFR § 1.132 filed June 29, 2006 is insufficient to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, first paragraph, for the following reasons. Specifically, data for PRO1281 does not appear in the table (Exhibit B). Furthermore, it is not clear how the clones appearing in the table compare to PRO1281, or if the results presented in the table were determined by the same methodology as presented in the cited

Art Unit: 1647

Example of the instant specification. For example, how highly expressed were the genes in Exhibit B that purportedly correlate with increased protein levels, 2-fold, 5-fold, 10-fold? How many samples were used? By what means was the level of mRNA expression determined, e.g., microarray, Northern blot, quantitative PCR? Was the “universal normal control” used or were matched tissue controls used? The declaration only states that levels of mRNA and protein in tumor tissue were compared to normal tissue.

The specification indicates overexpression of PRO1281 mRNA in tumor tissue (the numerical increase is not known). However, the specification fails to precisely disclose any correlation between the reported overexpression of PRO1281 mRNA and PRO1281 protein expression, and more importantly, to what extent PRO1281 mRNA is reliably overexpressed in a particular tumor sample, such that the PRO1281 polypeptide encoded thereby could be used as a diagnostic marker for such tumors. There is no evidence regarding whether or not PRO1281 polypeptide levels are overexpressed in such tumors.

Also, with the exception of Futcher et al. (1999), all of Applicant’s newly cited references are directed to the analysis of single genes, or a small group of genes, and therefore do not demonstrate trends found across proteins in general. Applicant also asserts that Futcher et al. conducted a study of mRNA and protein expression in yeast and report a good correlation between protein abundance, mRNA abundance, and codon bias. Applicant’s arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive. Futcher et al. concludes that “[t]his validates the use of mRNA abundance as a rough predictor of protein abundance, at least for relatively abundant proteins [emphasis added]” (pg 7368, col 1). Futcher et al. also admits that Gygi et al. performed a similar study and generated similar data, but reached a different conclusion. Futcher et al. indicates that “Gygi et al. feel that mRNA abundance is a poor predictor of protein abundance” (pg 7367, col 1, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph).

Finally, the state of the art, as evidenced through textbooks and review papers, clearly establishes that polypeptide levels cannot be accurately predicted from mRNA levels. Lilley et al. teach that “DNA chips (mRNA profiling studies) can contribute to the study of gene expression in response to a particular biological perturbation. However, the extrapolation that changes in transcript level will also result in corresponding changes in protein amount or activity cannot always be made” (“Proteomics” Molecular Biology in Cellular Pathology, (2003) England: John Wiley & Sons, page 351). Wildsmith et al. also disclose that the gene expression data obtained from a microarray may differ from protein expression data (“Gene Expression Analysis Using Microarrays” Molecular Biology in Cellular Pathology, (2003) England: John Wiley & Sons, pages 269-286, especially pg 283). King et al. disclose that “it has been established that mRNA levels do not necessarily correlate with protein levels” (pg 2287, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph). King et al. state that it has been demonstrated that correlation between mRNA and protein

Art Unit: 1647

abundance is less than 0.5 and that "mRNA expression studies should be accompanied by analyses at the protein level" (pg 2287, bottom of col. 1 through the top of col. 2).

It is believed that all pertinent arguments have been addressed.

**6. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph - enablement**

A. Claims 119-126 and 129-131 remain rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for the reasons already of record on page 5 of the Office Action dated 8/11/05 as well as for the reasons given in the above rejection under 35 USC 101. Applicants argue that the claimed invention is enabled because it has utility as argued previously. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered, but are not found to be persuasive for the reasons discussed above.

B. Claims 119-123 and 129-131 remain rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for the reasons already of record on pages 5-6 of the Office Action mailed 8/11/05. Applicants argue that the rejection is improper for the reasons stated in the Appeal Brief and Reply Brief. These arguments have been considered, but are not deemed persuasive for the reasons found in the Examiner's Answer 1/23/06.

Respectfully, the standard for enablement is "make and use" not "make and test." While Applicants have provided a list of amino acids to be used as the substitutions in the protein and while Applicants may have disclosed how one would go about identifying functional proteins (or ones overexpressed) this is general information only. Screening methods are well-known in the art. However, this information does not provide any specific guidance as to what changes to make to the full-length protein of SEQ ID NO:326. No specific regions, or critical amino acids have been identified which would be required to retain function of SEQ ID NO:326. Applicants have not provided any guidance or working examples showing that any protein other than SEQ ID NO:326 is overexpressed. The artisan is not able to predict what other proteins would be overexpressed in colon tumors, or what the function of these proteins would be. While Applicants can physically make any protein 80% identical to SEQ ID NO:326, it would require undue experimentation for the artisan to make a protein overexpressed in tumors. Furthermore, the utility of this protein would not be known, as discussed above.

Art Unit: 1647

**7. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph – written description**

A. Claims 119-123 and 129-131 remain rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for the reasons already of record on pages 6-7 of the Office Action mailed 8/11/05.

Applicants argue that the rejection is improper for the reasons stated in the Appeal Brief and Reply Brief. These arguments have been considered, but are not deemed persuasive for the reasons found in the Examiner's Answer 1/23/06.

First, while overexpression may be considered a function of the protein, Applicants have not sufficiently described the genus of polypeptides overexpressed in colon tumors. Applicants have only identified one protein (SEQ ID NO:326) which is overexpressed. This is not representative of a genus. This information does not provide any specific guidance as to what changes to make to the full-length protein of SEQ ID NO:326. No specific regions, or critical amino acids have been identified which would be required to retain function of SEQ ID NO:326. While screening methods, methods of determining percent identity and exemplary substitutions are well-known in the art, this, again, does not provide specific information about SEQ ID NO:326. This issue is not in calculating percent identity, or being able to screen the test proteins. The issue is in the description of the genus. If the artisan made a protein less than the full length of SEQ ID NO:326, he/she would not be able to determine whether this protein is overexpressed in colon tumors. In making such a protein Applicants would basically be "guessing" which of these protein variants were overexpressed in colon tumors. Other than this function, there is nothing which links the proteins of the claimed genus together. For example, "proteins which bind serotonin" would be a clear function which relates the proteins in the genus together. The fact that these proteins are only overexpressed in a specific tumor does not provide information to the artisan so that he/she is able to make a protein fitting that genus. Whereas certain adequate description may be gained from proteins related in function in which this function is an activity, the same is not true for the present genus. It cannot be determined which regions to retain in order to ensure that the protein is overexpressed in colon tumors. Each protein would have to be examined independently. One would not expect that a random protein 99% identical to SEQ ID NO:326, if the variant even naturally exists, to be overexpressed simply because a homologous protein is overexpressed. Without knowing the function of that protein then the artisan cannot simply say "well, they are close. Therefore, I would expect this protein, of which I do not know the function, to be overexpressed as well." Until the function of that protein is determined, such a specific knowledge of the intricacies of gene expression in cancer cells is not clear. The role of SEQ ID NO:326 in the cell and in cancer development and progression may be completely different from that of a protein 80% (or greater) identical to SEQ ID NO:326.

Art Unit: 1647

**8. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

A. Claims 119-126 and 129-131 remain rejected under 35 USC 102, for the reasons already of record on page 8 of the Final Rejection mailed 8/11/05. The invention does not possess utility as discussed above under 35 USC 101. Therefore, the effective filing date remains that of the instant application, 11/14/01.

**9. Conclusion**

A. No claim is allowable.

This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/993,604. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**Advisory information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Landsman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0888. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 10 AM – 7 PM (eastern).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback can be reached on 571-272-0961. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Robert Landsman  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1647